## REMARKS

Applicants are grateful to the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 8.

Applicants request that the Finality of the Office Action be withdrawn. The Office Action applies a newly cited reference in rejecting the application. Applicants only seek a fair opportunity to respond to the reference and the rejection.

Claim Rejection based on Schofield et al. in view of Mori et al.

 $\langle j \rangle$ 

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Number 5,670,935 to Schofield et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,660,454 to Mori et al.

Applicants' apparatus for displaying a video image of the travel path of a vehicle includes a reticle to reduce the light transmissivity of the out-of-path portion, as shown in Fig. 3 and described on page 3, starting at line 27. This shading effect provides the driver with an image that may be readily interpreted for determining if an object resides in the in-path or out-of-path portions of the image. As acknowledged by Examiner, Schofield et al. do not disclose using a reticle for displaying a video image having a first light transmissivity and a second light transmissivity perceptibly different from the first light transmissivity and so does not teach or suggest this feature.

The rejection relies on Mori et al. to make up the deficiency. Mori et al. shows a system for aiming a headlamp to improve the headlamp illumination pattern as the vehicle approaches a curve or travels about a curve, as shown in FIG. 21 and 22 and described starting at column 19, line 25. The rejection alleges that the controlling of the illumination pattern in Mori et al. corresponds to the reticle in Applicants' apparatus. Mori et al. shows a camera, see FIG. 6, for

viewing a scene ahead of the vehicle, where the signal from the camera is provided to an image processor, as described beginning at col. 8, line 2. The camera and image processor are part of a roadway-imaging-system that makes a prediction of the future position of the vehicle and uses that prediction to aim the headlamp, see col. 2, lines 20-33. However, Mori et al. does not provide a display of the camera image viewable by the driver, and so does not disclose or need a reticle. Moreover, Mori et al. relies on the combination of illumination intensity and reflectivity of the light from the headlights. In contrast, the reticle in Applicants' apparatus varies the transmissivity that forms the video image. That is, even if the system in Mori et al. included a display, which it does not, the image would be based on the illumination pattern and the reflected light as received without varying the transmissivity of any portion thereof. Thus, there is nothing in Mori et al. that would lead the practitioner to modify the video system in Schofield to form an image using a reticle to vary the transmissivity of light that is received in different portions. Thus, even if combined the references do not point to Applicants' invention.

Claim 1 is directed to Applicants' apparatus for displaying a video image that includes a reticle for delineating in-path and out-of-path portions. In accordance with the claim, the reticle is provided so the in-path portion is displayed with a first light transmissivity, and the out-of-path portion is displayed with a second, perceptibly different light transmissivity. Neither Schofield et al. or Mori et al. teach or suggest using a reticle to vary the transmissivity of in-path and out-of-path portions in displaying a video image. Thus, even when combined, the references do not teach or suggest Applicants' apparatus in claim 1.

1

Claims 2 - 6 are dependent on claim 1 and so are also not taught or suggested by Schofield et al. in view of Mori et al. for reasons set forth with regard to amended claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection based in Schofield et al. in view of Mori et al. be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

Claim Rejection based on Schofield et al. in view of Mori et al. and further in view of Chin et al.

Claims 7 and 9-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Number 5,670,935 to Schofield et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,660,454 to Mori et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,673,143 to Chin et al.

Claims 7 and 9-10 are dependent on claim 1. For the reason set forth above, neither Schofield et al. nor Mori et al. show using a reticle to vary the light transmissivity in forming the image as recited in claim 1. It follows then that the reference does not show the invention in the dependent claims that incorporate the features of claim 1.

Chin et al. describes a thermal imaging camera and a variety of lenses to be used with the camera. The specification starting at column 2, line 32 describes various aiming reticle and one or more sets of stadia lines to assist the camera user with aiming and range estimation. In contrast, Applicants describe a reticle that delineates the in-path and out-of-path portions of a video image by displaying the out-of-path portion and the in-path portion using a perceptibly different light transmissivity for each portion. Neither Schofield et al. nor Mori et al. nor Chin et al. shows this feature. Thus, the references, even when combined do not point to Applicants' invention in claim 1, or in claims 7 and 9-10 dependent thereon.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection based on Schofield et al. in view of Mori et al. in further view of Chin et al. be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

## Conclusion

If it would further prosecution of the application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the phone number provided.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 50-0831.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas D. Fekete Reg. No. 29,065

Delphi Technologies, Inc.

Legal Staff - M/C 480-410-202

P.O. Box 5052

Troy, Michigan 48007-5052

(248) 813-1210